What the Newspapers Didn't Say About the Death of Toscanini, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 4 JANUARY 28, 1957 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Back to Cold War and Hot Air

The problems of the world are so complicated that it is a pity people's minds have to be further confused by the kind of chrome-plated generalities and warmed up helium which filled the President's inaugural address, as it did his State of the Union message. The style had the sheen of good advertising copy; it subordinated realistic discussion to selling. The new arms budget, highest ever in peacetime, was sold as "the price of peace." The world scene was pictured again as cold war melodrama: the struggle of us goodies against them baddies. The world is indeed divided, but division cannot be blamed entirely on Them. Our friends, Syngman Rhee, Chiang Kai-shek, and Diem are also dividers; ready, like the Communists for unity at any time, but on their own terms. The President spoke of "tragically" divided Germany, but it is a tragedy that rests very lightly on Dr. Adenauer and our big business friends in the Reich. They are in no hurry to assume the economic and political problems of the impoverished, socialistic and Protestant East zone. We say we don't like a world divided, but the countries like India which feel that way and try to stand aside from the general division of mankind we stigmatize as "neutralist," a bad word. We say we don't like a divided Europe, but in both addresses as at press conference last week the President showed remarkably little interest in trying by diplomacy to achieve the withdrawal of the Russians. But who expects sensible discussion of detergents in soap copy? Better just to say, "It floats."

A Little Sober Truth Would Be Helpful

The trouble with continually picturing our side as 99 44/100 percent pure is that it creates a public mind totally unprepared for the give-and-take necessary to heal the discords of an imperfect world. We are so used to hearing about the "free world" that we forget that most of our allies in that free world run regimes as dictatorial and as bloody but often a good deal less constructive than those of the Communist States. Most of Latin America, virtually all of the Middle East, are governed by dictators dependent for their maintenance on armed force, which we supply under "mutual aid" (shade of Kropotkin!). When the President spoke of "the building of a peace with justice in a world where moral law prevails" he was talking in the kind of rhetoric which unfits free men for tackling real problems. The corollary of all those rosy words is that until we reach this pie-in-the-sky state of virtue we must continue to arm to the teeth. We are all for justice, but it can only be achieved slowly, by charity, and patience. What is the just solution—to take only problems divorced from the Communist issue—in North Ireland, or Algeria, or Cyprus, or Palestine, or Kashmir? No solution to these old and tangled feuds is possible which will not be unjust to somebody. The President's oversimplified self-righteous rhetoric may drum up emotions for war. It will never prepare men to compromise for peace.

Up and Up

"The new and more powerful weapons which are being delivered to our Armed Forces in increasing quantities and varieties are much more costly to produce, operate and maintain than the weapons they are replacing. Furthermore, we are now engaged in the development of a whole new family of even more advanced weapons for all the services. Large expenditures will be required to bring these weapons into use. During the transition, we must continue to purchase enough of the current types to preserve our readiness until the effectiveness of the advanced weapons is demonstrated in tests." *—The President's new budget message.*

Dwight Eisenhower is a man who shies away from a scrap, and gravitates naturally to the path of least resistance. This is evident in dealing with our most acute domestic problem, that of race relations. It was characteristic of him in the State of the Union message to advocate a program of school aid "uncomplicated by provisions dealing with the complex problems of integration." Mr. Eisenhower is all for Law, with a big capital L, until he runs up against a law difficult to enforce. At press conference last Wednesday he looked relaxed and confident until Robert Spivack of the *New York Post* asked him about the appeal by Southern Negro leaders that he come South and use his influence to stem the rising mood of violence. He was at a loss for an answer, consulted with Jim Hagerty and then replied lamely that the request had been referred to the Justice Department for study. We can just see the lights burning there far into the night.

The G.O.P. Elected A Truman Democrat

That instinctive fondness for the easy way out is charting the course of the next four years. We wish there was comfort to be found in the symbolism of the attack made on Mr. Eisenhower at the very beginning of his second term by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce. The Council, like his own Secretary of the Treasury, objects to the huge budget and its renewed and New Dealish spending. But this welfare state to which Eisenhower is turning comes coupled with the garrison State; Humphrey represented the big business influence which was against New Dealism but was also for relaxation of world tension to cut arms spending. The weakening of his influence is therefore no unmixed blessing. Ahead of us lies renewed cold war and arms race, sugar-coated by social welfare measures. But the major share goes to the Pentagon; the blueprint is to make all the world outside the Soviet zone our protectorate and beneficiaries. Mr. Eisenhower has emerged as a Truman Democrat, dependent on the arms race as the WPA of our prosperity, and facing inflation with essential equanimity.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We Use Milder Methods Than The Fascismo Against Which the Maestro Protested

Meditations on the Death of Toscanini and the Artist in America . . .

All the obituaries of Toscanini told how he had defied Mussolini and refused to play the Fascist hymn, "Giovannezza," choosing exile rather than knuckle under. But of all the newspaper writers who applauded the Maestro's bravery, who was brave enough to note that we ourselves do not encourage our artists to be Toscaninis? We do not use the bludgeon and castor oil, as the Black Shirts did, to enforce conformity. We have milder methods for frightening people. We put them in the pillory before the Senate Internal Security Committee or the House Un-American Activities Committee. We make them unemployable. If Toscanini had dared criticize this American variant of *Fascismo,* we would probably have driven him into exile as we did Chaplin, or kept him here under "house arrest" as we do Paul Robeson, punishing him by refusing to let him perform abroad. Our artists have been taught that it is safer not to mix in politics.

In this sense, not to mix in politics, is not to mix in life, to be but half a man; to look the other way when other men are treated unjustly; if there are crematoria, not to hear the screams; to abdicate. How can one be a true artist, striving unattainably to express the deeper meanings, as Toscanini did, and be but half a man? Can a eunuch make love? Toscanini in this was like Einstein, and it is something to remember that the greatest conductor of our time, like the greatest physicist, was an anti-Fascist; both chose exile rather than submission. But where are the younger men to follow them?

The Intellectual As Puppet

In the U.S., as in the U.S.S.R., the artists, scientists and intellectuals are encouraged to take part in politics but only as the State orchestrates it. There they are encouraged to criticize Western imperialism, here to speak out against Soviet oppression in Hungary. There the first question they ask you is about Paul Robeson, but it is considered bad taste to ask them about the Soviet Robesons, the dissident artists and writers who ended up in sub-Arctic labor camps. Here we are allowed to celebrate the way the writers and newspapermen resisted in Budapest, staking their lives on the demand for free expression. But I did not notice any of our newspapermen demonstrating outside the half empty courtroom in Washington last Friday where Robert Shelton of the *New York Times* was found guilty of contempt for invoking his First Amendment rights before the Senate Internal Security Committee, and Mary Knowles the librarian was given 120 days in jail for the same offense.

There is a numbness in the national air. There was no hostile mob outside the courthouse. There were no sympathizers massed within it. Every day we are told that freedom is the precious possession we must be ready at the drop of a bomb to defend with our lives against Them, but nobody took an hour off from work to come down to the courtroom and see whether maybe the First Amendment was in danger. Our reflexes have not been conditioned to associate the First Amendment with the Freedom on which the Pentagon puts a big capital F; the Bill of Rights is not conspicuous in the briefings of the Strategic Air Command. Indeed, as the sophisticated may whisper to you, that stuff about the First Amendment is "commie talk." *Real* Americans don't talk that line. It's "commie" here and "bourgeois" there. This is the shadow of what Orwell saw coming.

New Attack On The Blacklist

"If the respondents, monopolizing all employment opportunities in the motion picture industry, had agreed among themselves to hereafter exclude all Negroes, Republicans or Jews from the industry, and the state courts had refused all redress to the persons affected, it appears clear that this [the U.S. Supreme] Court would consider the matter ripe for adjudication. . . . The central issue here is whether affected persons following a like calling are without similar recourse to the Constitution when the agreement by the same monopolistic combination excludes from the industry all those who claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the federal Constitution before a federal legislative inquiry, or who, when named as Communists, fail to voluntarily appear and answer all questions without invocation of their Constitutional privileges. . . ."

—Petition to the Supreme Court (granted last week) by 23 blacklisted Hollywood artists and writers against film companies and members of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Conscience Is Contempt

Our country is supposed to be the citadel of private conscience against State power. But when Mrs. Knowles' lawyer, Henry Sawyer III, a Philadelphia City Councilman, spoke with passion of the Christian and Quaker tradition against informing, of early Church Council edicts against those who turned their brothers in, of the Quaker printer William Bradford who in 1689 was the first man in the New World to invoke the privilege, his moving words seemed to find a wall rather than an audience in the owlish rotund man on the bench with the dark-rimmed spectacles. It was only when Sawyer pleaded that if Mrs. Knowles had submitted to the authority of the committee it would have meant informing on the father of her son that the Judge was moved, but in the other direction. Judge Rizley broke in to say that he had seven children and eleven grandchildren and that his sons and sons-in-law had been engaged all over the world in the Army, the Air Force and the Marines in resisting Communism. The Judge told Sawyer, "I just can't bring myself to say to her that she should not serve some time." Mrs. Knowles made an appealing figure as she stood there awaiting sentence, thin and wan in a trim suit. The Judge made a great show of being troubled, but he sentenced her to four months. No harm would have come to her, he said, if she had only answered the committee's questions. "Suppose," he asked, again referring to his sons and sons-in-law, "*they* refused to obey the command of their country?" Does a civilian owe the same duty to the State as a soldier? Is a citizen to be commanded in a free society? Was not Mrs. Knowles, too, a soldier in her way, standing on a battlefield colder and lonelier even than the 38th Parallel, in defense of something precious in America?

The Judge does not regard the Internal Security Committee's powers with niggardly eye. Mrs. Knowles had told the Committee she was not a Communist, that she had not been associated since 1947 with any organization on the Attorney General's list, that she had no knowledge to impart of any un-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They Demonstrate in Budapest For 1st Amendment Rights But Not in Washington

. . . Do American Newspapermen Really Care About Freedom of the Press?

lawful act, and that she was after all not a government employee but worked in a private library belonging to a Quaker group. The Judge brushed all this aside, as had the Committee. Its real target in hauling her before it for the second time in September, 1955, was the Fund for the Republic, which has given Plymouth Meeting $5,000 for its courage in continuing to employ Mrs. Knowles. The Committee, like the Inquisition, regards the uncowed spirit as an affront. It would if it could wipe out every center of resistance.

Shelton's case was similar. He, too, was an innocent bystander, a case of mistaken identity caught in the cross-fire of the Committee's attempt to smear the critical *New York Times*. Shelton's counsel, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., made a vivid court record, though the only witness called was Jules Sourwine. He was the Committee's counsel when it launched its investigation of newspaper business a year ago and is back as assistant counsel, after an ignominious defeat in Nevada politics where he hoped to become a U.S. Senator.

The Man-in-the-Street Theory

By tart questioning, Rauh showed that America's greatest newspaper was the focus of the Committee's abortive inquiry into Communist "infiltration of the press." Only witnesses whose silence or testimony might reflect upon the *New York Times* were called in open session; no other newspaper was investigated; Shelton himself was called by mistake. One of those precious informers who cannot even get names right had Shelton mixed up with another [non-Communist] newspaperman of the same last name. Prosecutor William Hitz, Jr., defended this light-hearted method of serving subpoenas by advancing the theory that the Committee has power to pick up any "man on the street" and haul him up for interrogation on his political views, whether or not there is "probable cause" (as the criminal law requires) to believe that he has pertinent information. This was substantially upheld by the Judge.

Perhaps the most alarming aspect of the Shelton trial was the Judge's magnanimity to the *New York Times*. The Judge observed that the Court was prepared to take judicial notice of the fact that no one had accused that paper of being Communistic. When judges begin to take judicial notice of whether papers are subversive or not, it is time for thoughtful editors to begin to worry. A free press was never supposed to operate, like a trusteeship, under the watchful eye of the courts. Or of Congress. Judge Rizley added that his generous offer of a clean bill of health to the *New York Times* did not mean that Congress doesn't have power to investigate it. Indeed the resolution establishing the Senate Committee on Internal Security, like that establishing the House Committee on Un-American Activities, is so broad and vague that it can investigate anyone whose ideas it considers dangerous. It is not Judge Rizley's reasoning but the resolutions on which attack must be made.

Must The Zengers Be Dead?

A second *New York Times* employe, Seymour Peck, goes on trial next week, also for contempt of the Senate Internal Security Committee. A different kind of judge, Luther Youngdahl, presides over his trial but the outcome is unlikely to be very different. Conviction of contempt is all but a foregone conclusion in that and in the case of a third *New York Times* man awaiting trial. The newspaper announced that Shelton's status as an employe will remain unchanged until final disposition of the case. But what does that mean? Will the three lose their jobs if they lose on appeal? Will the *New York Times* finally treat as disreputable characters men who are risking a great deal in defense of the freedom of our profession? Do we only honor Peter Zengers when long dead? When will the *New York Times* take the offensive?

What if a new McCarthy appears? What is to keep him from subpoenaing a whole brigade of *New York Times* men and smearing that paper with the hue and cry of loose Red charges? Newspaper business is full of ex-liberals and ex-radicals with past utterances and associations easily exhumed and exploited against the background of an alleged Communist "conspiracy" to infiltrate the press.

The ANG: Scared and Silent

Against this background it is painful to report that the American Newspaper Guild has done nothing to help the newspapermen caught in the Committee's web, and that the *New York Post* seems to be the only big paper in the country which is treating this affair as it deserves. The *Post* sent its brilliant columnist, Murray Kempton, to cover the Shelton trial; it carried a strong and serious editorial on the implications of the verdict. But when are other editors going to react?

We urge editors also to look at the new revised "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications" just published by the House Committee. It has added to the blacklist "The National Guardian" and "Jewish Life," along with the vanished Progressive Party. Let them ask themselves whether we are going to allow the fungoid growth of an atmosphere in which it begins to be taken for granted that a Congressional committee—or any other agency of government—may decide which publications are subversive and which are not. Now, in this lull, when reaction ebbs and the battle would be easy, is the time to wipe out this excrescence on a free society.

Bulletin on the Right to Travel

Washington—In a surprise move the Court of Appeals has ordered a reargument on January 29 before the full 9-man bench of the passport suits brought by the artist Rockwell Kent and the Los Angeles psychiatrist Dr. Walter Briehl. It did so without waiting for a decision by the three judges who heard the appeals last Fall—Edgerton, Bazelon and Prettyman, a panel 2-1 liberal. In the Gold, Flaxer and Watkins cases, a reargument before the full bench resulted in a decision for the government. Both Kent and Dr. Briehl refused as a matter of principle to file a non-Communist affidavit with their applications for a passport. One of the three judges who heard their case has asked the government to file a memorandum setting forth the periods since 1918 when it has been illegal for an American to travel abroad without a passport and the legal authority for the restrictions. In another passport suit on which argument has already been heard, that of the writer Donald Ogden Stewart, now living in England, the Court will decide whether a non-Communist affidavit covering the last 15 years is sufficient test of political purity to qualify for the right to travel.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Polish Election and Ibn Saud's Tender Feelings

The results of the Polish election were hardly a compliment to the Russians. It was fear that they might do in Poland what they have done in Hungary that led the majority of Poles to vote for the moderate Gomulka. Those elements in the Polish Communist party most subservient to Russia dabbled in anti-Semitism in their inner party feud with Gomulka, another indication of the degeneracy among the orthodox Stalinist elements. One of the dramatic episodes of the campaign was a broadcast over BBC by the poet, Czeslaw Milosz, urging the voters to support Gomulka. Milosz, whom I knew as cultural attache at the Polish Embassy here in Washington, defected when he could no longer stand Communist thought control and is living in self-imposed exile in Paris. He was a hero of the anti-Nazi underground. His book, "The Captive Mind," is a first rate study of the intellectuals under Stalinism.

On the eve of Ibn Saud's visit, Dave Sentner, Hearst's Washington Bureau chief disclosed (New York *Journal-American,* Jan. 21) the government was so afraid he might shut off the Armaco pipeline during the Suez crisis that "Administration press agents circulated among newspaper bureaus and pleaded for soft-pedalling of any news about American oil being earmarked for Britain and France." . . . His Majesty will be pleased to hear that even now Texas is loyally refusing to allow increased production of oil to help the West European infidel. . . . Ibn Saud is not as tender of Washington's feelings. The agreement among Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia to take over Britain's subsidy to the Arab Legion in Jordan was not only a defeat but an affront. . . . Ibn Saud didn't even wait to hear what Eisenhower had to propose. . . . There are reports here that the State Department hoped for the dissolution of the Jordanian State, winning Ibn Saud's support for its partition by giving him the land east of the Jordan. . . .

Labor Relations in Saudi Arabia

"Last June 4,000 workers struck at Aramco just before Saud paid a formal visit, greeted him shouting of 'oppression' by foreign imperialists. Saud's police beat several demonstrators to death with palm stems."
—Time Magazine, January 28.

Look for demands on Capitol Hill for an investigation of Stevenson's statement in *Look* (Feb. 5 "Why I Raised the H-Bomb Question"), "There was, indeed, reason to believe that the National Security Council itself between September 5 and September 19 had voted 'unanimously' in favor of a similar superbomb proposal; but this decision had been set aside for obviously political reasons. . . ." The President's refusal to confirm or deny this at press conference last week is regarded as tantamount to confirmation.

Judging by the import of sharp questioning from the bench during argument of the Ben Gold appeal last week, the Supreme Court may order a new trial for the Fur Workers' leader. The Justices seemed most interested in visits paid by an FBI agent to three members of the jury during the fourth week of his trial on charges of falsely swearing he was no longer a Communist. Government counsel claimed the visits were accidental, that the agent was investigating jury panels to see whether certain persons on them had been receiving communistic literature. Defense Counsel Harold Cammer pleaded that the visits were calculated to intimidate and constituted jury tampering. . . . Senator Langer (R. N.D.) last Tuesday put into the Congressional Record the text of the Circuit Court decision reversing the contempt convictions of Corliss Lamont, Abe Unger and Albert Shadowitz, with a tribute to Lamont.

And now that Krushchev has discovered that Stalin was such a fine fellow, we wonder how soon it will be before the Kremlin begins to explain that the Krushchev speech of last February attacking him was just a State Department invention.

About Those Doves

"An exuberant spokesman for the Air Force says the B-52 achievement demonstrates that our long range bomber force has the 'capability to drop a hydrogen bomb anywhere in the world.' This conjures up a reassuring picture of our ability to blast Russia whenever necessary, but we doubt that it is necessarily true.

"It is one thing to fly around the world and make a simulated bomb drop over an undefended area. It is something else to drop a bomb over a target that will be heavily defended by modern fighters, anti-aircraft guided missiles, etc. Furthermore, we would do well to keep in mind the point that if the Air Force claim is literally true, if this flight really demonstrates that we have the capability to drop an H-bomb anywhere in the world, the chances are that the Russians can do the same."*—Editorial, the Washington Sunday Star, Jan. 20*

Why Not Let Us Send A Free Sample Copy of This Issue to Your Local Editor

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:
(To) Name .....
1/28/57

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Pre-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 301 E. Capitol St., Washington 3, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED